1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
9	TH SEAT	
10	EDEN YOHANES et al.,	CASE NO. C20-101 MJP
11	Plaintiffs,	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO BIFURCATE
12	v.	
13	JAMES RIVER INSURANCE COMPANY,	
14	Defendant.	
15		
16		
17	This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Bifurcate and Stay	
18	Discovery (Dkt. No. 8). Having reviewed the Motion, the Response (Dkt. No. 11), and the	
19	Reply (Dkt. No. 13), the Court DENIES the Motion.	
20	The Court will not bifurcate the contract claim from the extra-contractual claims nor stay	
21	discovery at this stage of the case. The Parties are encouraged to file their dispositive motions in	
22	phases—with dispositive motions on the contract claim filed first—and to suggest a timeline for	
23		
24		

staging these motions to the Court. The Defendant may move for bifurcation again after motion practice is complete. The Court also DENIES Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Response. (Dkt. NO. 13 at 2-3.) Defendant argues that the Plaintiffs' Response was untimely under the Local Rules, contending that Defendant was prejudiced "because it had no time to consider the response and prepare a timely reply by the noted hearing date." (Dkt. No. 13 at 3.) While the Court finds that the Plaintiffs' Response was untimely under the Local Rules, Defendant submitted a ten-page Reply addressing the Plaintiffs' arguments (Dkt. No. 13), and the Court therefore finds Defendant's claims of prejudice unconvincing. The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel. Dated March 27, 2020. Maisley Helens United States District Judge